



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND ABSTRACTS.

Effects of Lumber Industry upon Agriculture in Sweden.—In treating the much-discussed effect of the modern timber industry upon agriculture in Sweden, A. G. Högbom draws an interesting comparison between two of the districts of Norrland. These districts, Löfånger and Nordsjö-Jörn, are extremes, inasmuch as the former is devoted almost entirely to agriculture, while the latter is a stronghold of the timber industry.

In the former there has been a rise of wages, owing to the attraction of the wood industry in inducing a movement of labor; this is made much of by the agriculturists. Nevertheless figures show a decided increase in the productiveness of agriculture since the introduction of the new industry (about 1870). Cultivated ground has extended from 1,500 to 4,300 hectares, live stock has doubled, and grain production has greatly increased. Considering the fact that more rational methods of cultivation have been introduced, it is likely that income from agriculture has doubled. Only the fertile southern province of Malmöhus ranks this northern district in productiveness.

Referring to figures for population, a remarkable result is found; population has increased only 1 per cent., while agricultural returns have doubled. This appears to denote a large augmentation of needs and a rise of the standard of living within the last decades. The present scarcity of labor is to be regarded as a temporary phenomenon.

Comparing now the forest regions of Nordsjö-Jörn (two neighboring districts taken together for the sake of attaining more representative results), the percentage of gain in cultivated ground, harvests, and stock does not differ much from that seen in Löfånger, except that the timber industry has greatly increased the demand for horses in the former district. Population has exhibited a much larger growth.

The author, basing his judgment upon personal observation, regards the manner of living and the needs of life as having been substantially alike in the two regions compared, and thinks that the augmented agricultural returns, in one case as in the other, went to satisfy raised standards of living. Under such conditions the energetic growth of population in Nordsjö-Jörn during the last decades must have been due to the hasty development of the timber industry.

This growth, also, the writer regards as merely temporary, and believes the contrasts of population will gradually disappear. He takes this case of extremes and eliminates less important factors in the hope of throwing some light upon the general and more complicated problem.—*Ekonomisk Tidskrift*, Häft 1, 1900. Condensed by A. G. KELLER.

The Social Question in the Nineteenth Century.—All epochs have had social agitations, but not until the nineteenth century have these appeared to be the essence of history. Changes in the industrial mechanism, as well as the participation of the popular classes in politics, are partly, but not wholly, responsible for this fact. The further responsibility is to be attributed to the French Revolution with its two erroneous principles: (1) the secularization of society, and (2) individualism. As a result of this revolution there was established a new order of things founded on the independence of man in his relationship to God, on the absolute predominance of individual interest, and on man's almost unlimited liberty with his equals.

The formation of associations, fraternities, and trade unions for the sake of counteracting the individualistic spirit propagated by the Revolution is one of the most significant facts of the later nineteenth century. This professional syndicate movement was strong enough and general enough to force parliament to abrogate in 1884 the law of 1791 prohibiting professional unions. No graver disavowal of the work of the Revolution could have been made.

There has thus been, in spite of individualistic principles, a general return to corporate organization throughout the French nation. Less than a century sufficed to make this inevitable; and the fact is the more significant because the revolutionists themselves initiated the reaction. From now on public opinion is going to proclaim a return to the régime of association to be either imposed by law or gained by liberty, and to the status of social legislation. This is the beginning of the counter-revolution. The threats of socialism have contributed largely to bring about this reaction. In fact, socialism has made gigantic strides in the last thirty years. Beginning with dreams of sentimental and vague utopias, it became saturated with the scientific doctrine formulated by Karl Marx; and today its various schools all aim at a redistribution of industrial and agricultural wealth to be brought about by means of the collective appropriation of the soil and of the instruments of labor. A materialistic conception of the society of the future has thus replaced the ideal of justice which haunted the brains of the revolutionists.

To such a movement, which is already sure of its ground, it is not sufficient to react negatively merely. A positive program must be opposed to it which shall establish the following principles: (1) the organization of such a corporate régime as shall bring together those social elements which are fitted for a common (social) function, and which shall grant to these associations, when given a permanent constitution, the power which is now vested almost entirely in the state; (2) a legislation imposing upon labor, property, and capital regulations conforming to divine law, to the solidarity of the family, and hence to public welfare. Such reforms are the only means of weeding out the evils engendered by individualism, and of saving society, by snatching it from the anarchy in which it is steeped and the socialism which is invading it, from the evils which threaten it. Furthermore, the Catholic church alone can inspire and direct these reforms, by restoring to the people the notion of Christian social right, which was destroyed by the Revolution, and by reinstating in the minds of men the philosophy of the gospel, which has been suppressed by the rationalism transmitted by the *Réforme aux Constituants de 1789*, by the false conception of man and society which Rousseau taught, and by the influence on our contemporaries of Kant and Hegel. The church alone can resolve the objection to social reform constituted by the rivalry of nations. She must be the mediator through whom international reform legislation is made—and such legislation is both possible and desirable.

Thus, in every respect, and from whatever point of view the social problem is considered, its solution rests in the precepts and the action of the church. And society can work out its salvation only by accepting Christian doctrine intact and applying it in custom, in institutional life, and in legislation; a merely superficial invocation of ecclesiastical aid will not be sufficient.

Liberalism is to be condemned in social and political theory just as is rationalism in metaphysical theory, the former because of the skepticism it has engendered in religion, the latter because of the powerful expansion of socialism which it has fostered.

The question which the twentieth century has to answer is: Will Christian citizens have sufficient faith, resolution, and devotion to join hands on the ground which their church shall indicate to them and to draw from her teachings a common program of action and of government?—A. DE MUN, "La question sociale au XIX^e siècle," in *L'Association catholique*, December 15, 1899.—A. D. S.

The Corporate Movement in Europe.—The present century, in contrast to the negation and destruction of traditional authority which marked the eighteenth century, has been one of pretty steady reconstruction and reorganization. The chief agent which has furnished the formulas for the solution of the great religious, political, and economic problems, with which the century has had to deal, has been modern sciences. Men are today again strongly feeling the need of a more stable authority, yet an authority based, not upon mere tradition or physical force, but upon free discussion and scientific inquiry. This tendency is evident in both the religious and the political spheres, almost running to the extreme again, in some parts of Europe, of the aristocratic and imperial ideal of authority by force and tradition. But especially marked, in its free, democratic form, is this movement in the industrial world. The great discoveries of science applied to industry in the form of machinery, increasing

production, and quickening communication, have completely upset the old organization on the basis of status; and, inaugurating the system of free contract, have now begun to result in the elimination of the middle classes, the small producers and traders, who from time immemorial have been the backbone of commerce, and to compel them to swell the unstable crowd of salaried workers under the dominance of a few shrewd and strong-handed captains of industry. That this situation has become very precarious is witnessed to by the rapid rise, in recent years, in all parts of Europe, of socialist, anarchist, trade-union, "coöperative," and other labor movements.

Socialism, which is rapidly gaining ground, is a more or less blind reaction against *laissez-faire*, and a grouping for a principle and a condition of stability and authority consistent with freedom. The form in which this purpose is stated is two-fold, viz.: (1) the nationalization of the soil and the instruments of production, (2) the organization of labor and the distribution of its products by the state. But the purpose, carried out in this form, would defeat itself by the suppression of all initiative and all liberty, because it provides no adequate way of educating and thoroughly modifying the natures of the individuals to fit them for such a condition.

But parallel to this socialist movement is the general labor-union movement throughout Europe, which is instinctively turning toward that general form of organization by trades and professions which characterized the days of the guilds. This movement, guided by, and given part in, a wise state legislation, we believe to be an effective antidote to the vagaries of socialism, and the only rational basis on which to found the representative institutions of modern democracy. These trade organizations of the Middle Ages had for their chief principles the protection of all working-men against the encroachments of the stronger and more skillful, and in general against all enterprises of speculation, by the establishment of fraternal relations between masters and workmen. They succeeded in insuring to the people (1) a legitimate influence in the questions of wages and conditions of labor, (2) an efficient guarantee against slack work, accidents, and sickness, and (3) the enjoyment of a common patrimony, insuring to them a dignified standing in the community, the representation of their true interests, and security in old age. The advantages of this corporate régime have not been given an equivalent substitute by the modern doctrines of popular sovereignty and universal suffrage, which is carried out too often merely in name rather than in spirit. We must have an intelligent governmental encouragement of the trade-union movement.

I. In England such encouragement and direction is farthest advanced. Aside from the advantages of the principles of collective bargaining, mutual insurance, and sliding wage scales, worked out chiefly through the efforts of the unions, Parliament has, by a series of laws since 1875, established the privileges of: 56½ hours as the working week for adults; Sunday rest; special labor rules for women and children; a minimum wage for all work for the state, for cities, and for public corporations; and employers' insurance of employés in cases of injury incurred while the latter are at work.

II. In Germany the labor corporations have developed under very different conditions; having never become thoroughly legalized as in England, so in Germany employers' insurance and other labor benefits are granted. Yet, in contrast to the English law, the German gives the workmen the right only to present petitions upon the rates of wages and decisions made by the employers. But it suppresses the right of the laborers to assemble and freely discuss the conditions of the contracts of their employment. To be treated as men, therefore, is the keynote of the German labor movement.

III. The Austrian parliament has in recent years thoroughly reconstituted the labor laws of that country. Sickness, age, and other similar benefit laws are based on those of Germany; but, in contrast to the German law, workmen and employers are given opportunity to regulate jointly the conditions of production.

IV. In Belgium, as well as in Austria, the corporate movement is characterized by the formation of strong organizations among the employers; but the forces of the labor organizations have been turned largely into the current of socialism.

VI. In France nothing of much consequence has been done to assist the labor and trade unions to form effective organizations.—M. CH. LE COUR GRANDMAISON, "Le mouvement corporatif en Europe," in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, February 15, 1900.

Philosophy and Modern Culture.—Our modern life, if we study it in its society talk, and in that faithful reflection of popular feeling and taste which our journals supply, exhibits much of coarse feeling, of affected taste, of superficial and half-eroneous ideas. If a man wants to feel justly and nobly, avoiding on the one hand the apathy which leaves the spirit inert, and on the other hand the exaggeration which deprives it of its equilibrium, if he wishes to avoid crude judgments on books and other works of art, he must inspect things more closely than the many are wont to do, so as to discover in what true worth resides. And this inspection, carried out thoughtfully and thoroughly, forms a part of philosophic investigation.

In the juster scale of emotional appreciations which the study of philosophy seems fitted to develop there is one ingredient which deserves special recognition—reflective humor. It may seem the height of paradox to say that philosophic reflection conduces to a fuller enjoyment of that quiet fun with which, according to our most humorous playwright, the world is teeming. Nevertheless philosophy, just because she boldly peers into the very heart of things, just because she ruthlessly tears of the mask and shows us their real visage, may train us, if only we have the natural endowment, to detect incongruities, absurdities, and so to garner food for quiet laughter, where the unphilosophic man sees nothing amusing. It may help us in many an hour of quiet detachment to view the whole scene of human life about us as one-half a comedy.

The same philosophic habit of mind, the determination to examine things to the bottom, so as to get at their real significance and value, which helps to perfect our emotional life, will aid in the cultivation of the highest type of volition. A philosophic spirit leads a man to brush off the artificial traditional respect which, like mildew, gathers about the aims of life, and to see just where the highest good is to be reached. No one can be said to possess culture who has not thought seriously about life's ends. And no one who wants to think seriously about these can fail to derive profit from a careful study of that branch of philosophy which is specially concerned with them, viz., ethics. You cannot be said to have made the value of your aims perfectly clear to yourself until you have thought about such a question as this: Is the true rational end of conduct happiness for oneself and for others, so far as a man can further this; or does it consist in something which lies near this, it is true, but differs profoundly from it, let us say in the growing perfection of our nature, and preëminently in the formation of a beautiful and strong moral character? To think about life's ends in this large way is to think ethically.

In its influence on the growing mind and character, philosophy tends to develop and to perfect our individuality. Philosophy can be and is studied and assimilated in a great many different ways, and, as a result, philosophic minds present much variety. The reason of this is, not merely that philosophy is so many-sided, presenting to the choice so many alternative views, but because, being an interpretation of experience, it makes so subtle and so profound an appeal to the sources of personality within us. It is certain that our temperament and innate tendencies do as much as the particular tenets of our teachers in determining the special directions of our philosophic thought.

Much of the old prejudice of men of science against "dreamy metaphysics" is out of date. The great characteristic of the movement of philosophic thought during the last two centuries is its growing respect for the realities of experience.

We are not forced to concede that philosophy yields only perfectly useless knowledge. It is only so long as you take utility in a narrow sense, insisting on a direct and obvious gain, that philosophy politely declines to meet your demands.—JAMES SULLY, "Philosophy and Modern Culture," in the *Fortnightly Review*, January, 1900.

Sociology in Secondary Schools.—Three answers to the question whether it is opportune to introduce sociology in the most advanced classes of the secondary schools.

1. Dr. E. Delbet says: The goal of education, which, for Comtean philosophy, is to prepare individuals to live in the environment by which they are surrounded, can be attained by one means only, *i. e.*, instruction as comprehensive as possible in the essential elements of the hierarchy of sciences, culminating in social science and ethics..

The question ought rather to be stated thus : Why has not sociology been taught in the secondary schools as well as ethics, which has long been regarded as the culmination of secondary education ?

The reasons for not introducing this branch are that the subject-matter of sociology lacks organization, and the science needs systematization. But even in spite of the present status of sociology, it is possible, opportune, and very desirable to introduce the subject in the secondary schools. It might well be introduced at the expense of philosophy—not including ethics. Possibly difficulties, such as objections from parents and dangerous discussions on sociological matters among the pupils, are not as great here as in the case of ethics, and, as in that case, may be avoided by a careful selection of prudent and reserved instructors.

If this subject cannot now be introduced in the secondary schools, the experiment should at least be tried in one or more of the Lycées of Paris, and in the École Normale, in both of which it would doubtless be very successful.

2. Mr. Marcel Bernès says : It would be useless to make further complications in curricula which ought rather, in more ways than one, to be simplified ; furthermore, it would be folly to teach in the secondary schools a subject in which even specialists have few points of agreement. Pupils between the ages of eight and eighteen are incapable of comprehending, and hence of taking any interest in, sociology. The introduction of this subject would make room for the habit of passing immature and erroneous judgments on the part of pupils.

But this is not to say that sociological ideas should be excluded from secondary education. It is not necessary always to follow closely the letter of the curriculum. On the contrary, despite the prevalent opinion that such procedure is necessary, incidental, programless instruction, so to speak, is the most effective means by which to introduce the pupil to concrete things and to the affairs of life. It is in this way that sociological ideas should be brought to the secondary pupil. Indeed, in the nature of the case, sociological ideas, like ethical ideas, are bound to creep in everywhere in this way unconsciously, whether we will or not. This is notably true in the study of psychology and ethics, which are to a considerable extent social ; and the isolation and systematization of their social aspect into a separate course or discipline would not be opportune in the secondary schools. On the contrary, many disadvantages would attend such procedure. Among other things, the dangerous tendency to cramp everything into formulæ and dogmas would be fostered ; furthermore, the very best method for introducing sociological ideas to young pupils would be discarded ; still further, the method of unconscious discovery would be sacrificed to that of explicit exposition.

3. Mr. Raoul de la Grasserie says : In just the degree in which a science is in its formative stage, it should not be taught. Accordingly, sciences should not be taught even in the universities until they have attained a certain degree of organization and stability. Sociology has reached such a condition of organization that it may be taught in the higher institutions, and ought to be taught there more universally than it is.

Sociology has its place also in secondary education, just as has psychology and history, of which, from the dynamic point of view, sociology is a kind of abstraction. Sociology should not, however, be carried bodily into the secondary schools. It has two branches : first, the abstract, which treats the fundamental problems of the social organism, of social laws, etc., and which is mainly disputed territory ; second, the concrete, which takes up social evolution in its various branches, economic, juridical, political, religious, etc.; this branch is in a sense a history, not of events, but of human conditions. It is this part of sociology which could and ought to be introduced in the secondary schools. Instruction in law should also be introduced as a basis for this study of sociology.—DELBET, BERNÈS, and RAOUL DE LA GRASSERIE, "Enquête sur l'introduction de la sociologie dans l'enseignement secondaire," in *Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, January, 1900.